

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on July 27, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

No claims are amended, canceled, or added; as a result, claims 1-49, and 74-84 are now pending in this application.

The claims are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Loughmiller. Applicant does not admit that the Loughmiller patent is prior art, and reserves the right to swear behind it at a later date. Nevertheless, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are distinguishable over the Loughmiller patent for the reasons presented below.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-19, 21-27, 29-38, 40-47, 74, and 76-84 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Loughmiller (U.S. 6,448,756).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because Loughmiller does not disclose all of the elements of claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites a delay lock loop (DLL) comprising:

“a delay line including an input for receiving an external clock signal, and multiple outputs for providing multiple delayed signals;

a selector connected to the multiple outputs for selecting one of the multiple delayed signals as an internal clock signal, wherein the multiple delayed signals have different delays in relation to the external clock signal; and

a command react circuit connected to the selector, the command react circuit capable of activating a command set signal for enabling the selector to select a different delayed signal among the multiple delayed signals based on a command signal while the external and internal clock signals are synchronized.”

Applicant is unable to find in Loughmiller at least one element recited of claim 1. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Loughmiller a delay line including an input for receiving an external clock signal and “multiple outputs for providing multiple delayed signals”.

Loughmiller discloses a delay line 102 (FIG. 1) in which delay line 102 includes only one output node 106 for providing a signal DLLclk.

As another example, Applicant is also unable to find in Loughmiller “a selector connected to the multiple outputs for selecting one of the multiple delayed signals as an internal

clock signal”. Loughmiller discloses in FIG. 1 a number of taps T0-TN, which are lines connected between shift register 108 and delay line 102. Thus, taps or lines T0-TN are not the same as the “selector” recited in claim 1. Further, notwithstanding that taps T0-TN are not the same as the selector of claim 1, the combination of shift register 108 and taps T0-TN of Loughmiller also is not the same as the selector of claim 1 because shift register 108 and taps T0-TN of Loughmiller have a function different from the function of the selector of claim 1. Taps T0-TN of Loughmiller are connected to *inputs* of delay line 102 to allow a *single* input signal XCLK to enter delay line 102 at a single entry point. Shift register 108 of Loughmiller controls taps T0-TN to choose the location of the single entry point. In contrast, the selector of claim 1 is “connected to the multiple outputs for selecting one of the multiple delayed signals as an internal clock signal”. Thus, Loughmiller do not disclose “a selector connected to the multiple outputs for selecting one of the multiple delayed signals as an internal clock signal”.

The reasons presented above demonstrate that claim 1 is not anticipated by Loughmiller because Loughmiller does not disclose all of the elements of claim 1. Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that claim 1 and its dependent claims be allowed.

Independent claims 6, 13, 22, 30, 41, 74, 79, and 82 recite elements similar to the elements of claim 1. Thus, claims 6, 13, 22, 30, 41, 74, 79, and 82 are also not anticipated by Loughmiller for reasons similar to the reasons presented above regarding claim 1. Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 6, 13, 22, 30, 41, 74, 79, and 82 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that claims 6, 13, 22, 30, 41, 74, 79, and 82 and their dependent claims be allowed.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 20, 28, 39, 48, 49, and 75 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loughmiller.

Dependent claims 20, 28, 39, 48, 49, and 75 depend from their respective independent claims 13, 22, 30, 41, and 74. As explained in the rejection under 35 USC § 102, Loughmiller does not disclose all of the elements of the independent claims. Thus, Loughmiller also does not disclose all of the elements of the dependent claims 20, 28, 39, 48, 49, and 75 because dependent

claims 20, 28, 39, 48, 49, and 75 incorporate the elements of the independent claims. Therefore, dependent claims 20, 28, 39, 48, 49, and 75 are patentable over Loughmiller. Applicant requests that the rejection of dependent claims 20, 28, 39, 48, 49, and 753 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that dependent claims 20, 28, 39, 48, 49, and 75 be allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative (612) 373-6969 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

DEBRA M. BELL


By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6969

Date


10/27/03

By


Viet V. Tong
Reg. No. 45,416

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 27th day of October, 2003

Name



Signature

